

REMARKS

Claim 11 has been rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim 10, and is equivalent to claim 11 prior to the amendment herein.

The Examiner rejected claims 10, 11, 14, 15, 20, 24, 27-29, and 31-33 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Hoffman et al. (USPAT 5578869, Hoffman) in view of Crane et al. (USPAT 4888449, Crane).

The Examiner rejected claims 12 and 25 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Hoffman and Crane as applied to claim 10 above, and further in view of optimization of ranges.

The Examiner rejected Claim 13 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Hoffman and Crane as applied to claim 10 above, and further in view of Shannon et al. (USPAT 5466617).

The Examiner rejected claim 16 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Hoffman and Crane as applied to claim 10 above, and further in view of Nishimura et al. (USPAT 5604380, Nishimura).

The Examiner rejected claim 17 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Hoffman and Crane as applied to claim 10 above, and further in view of Kozono (USPAT 5619070).

The Examiner rejected claim 21 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Hoffman and Crane as applied to claim 10 above, and further in view of Robeson et al. (USPAT 2297503, Robeson).

The Examiner rejected claims 22 and 23 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being

10/039,679

9

unpatentable over Hoffman and Cranc as applied to claim 10 above, and further in view of one of ordinary skill in the art.

Applicants respectfully traverse the §103 rejections with the following arguments.

35 U.S.C. §103

The Examiner rejected claims 10, 11, 14, 15, 20, 24, 27-29, and 31-33 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Hoffman et al. (USPAT 5578869, Hoffman) in view of Crane et al. (USPAT 4888449, Crane).

Applicants respectfully contend that claim 10 is not unpatentable over Hoffman in view of Crane, because Hoffman in view of Crane does not teach or suggest each and every feature of claim 10. For example, Hoffman in view of Crane does not teach or suggest the following feature of claim 10: "forming a first portion of the mineral layer on a first surface of the metallic plate and forming a second portion of the mineral layer on a second surface of the metallic plate, wherein the first surface of the metallic plate is about perpendicular to the second surface of the metallic plate" in combination with "forming a first portion of the adhesion promoter layer on the first portion of the mineral layer and forming a second portion of the adhesion promoter layer on the second portion of the mineral layer". Neither Hoffman nor Crane teach or suggest said feature of claim 10. Said feature of claim 10 is embodied in FIG. 4 of the present patent application.

Based on the preceding arguments, Applicants respectfully maintain that claim 10 is not unpatentable over Hoffman in view of Crane, and that claim 10 is in condition for allowance. Since claims 12-17, 20-23, 25, 27-29, and 33 depend from claim 10, Applicants contend that claims 12-17, 20-23, 25, 27-29, and 33 are likewise in condition for allowance.

Applicants respectfully contend that claim 12 is not unpatentable over Hoffman in view

of Crane, because Hoffman in view of Crane does not teach or suggest each and every feature of claim 10. For example, Hoffman in view of Crane does not teach or suggest the following feature of claim 11: "wherein forming the mineral layer includes forming the mineral layer having a mineral selected from the group consisting of silicon dioxide, silicon nitride, and silicon carbide".

The Examiner argues: "With regard to claim 11, Hoffman discloses in column 4, lines 40 - 56 wherein forming the mineral layer includes forming the mineral layer having a mineral selected from the group consisting of silicon carbide."

In response to the preceding argument by the Examiner, Applicants note that the Examiner alleges that non-conductive layer 24 of Hoffman denotes the mineral layer of claim 11. However, col. 4, lines 40-56 of Hoffman does not disclose that the non-conductive layer 24 may include silicon carbide. Accordingly, the Examiner's argument is not persuasive.

Based on the preceding arguments, Applicants respectfully maintain that claim 11 is not unpatentable over Hoffman in view of Crane, and that claim 11 is in condition for allowance.

CONCLUSION

Based on the preceding arguments, Applicants respectfully believe that all pending claims and the entire application meet the acceptance criteria for allowance and therefore request favorable action. If the Examiner believes that anything further would be helpful to place the application in better condition for allowance, Applicants invites the Examiner to contact Applicants' representative at the telephone number listed below.

Date: 02/03/2004

Jack P. Friedman
Jack P. Friedman
Registration No. 44,688

Schmeiser, Olsen & Watts
3 Lear Jet Lane, Suite 201
Latham, New York 12110
(518) 220-1850